

312 COMMENTARY ON MACAULAY'S
HISTORY

is therefore probable that Burnet exaggerated the effect of his interference, and that Macaulay followed him too implicitly.

On the other hand it is curious that Macaulay neglects the epistolary controversy between James and his daughter in 1687, for although the letters were not published until 1880, Burnet gives a full summary of them.¹ James explained his reasons for becoming a Catholic with a view to converting Mary, and sent her a book to study. She replied in a couple of letters which show a very sound knowledge of the points at issue and furnish a convincing proof of her firm attachment to the Protestant faith. She criticises the book with great keenness, and the vigour and clearness of her arguments contrast very remarkably with those of her father, who seems to have thought her incurable. The interest of this little controversy lies in the light it throws on the characters of the two disputants.

A more important matter Macaulay had perforce to leave untouched, through lack of material, was the gradual development and elevation of Mary's character. In the possession of the Earl Bathurst at Cirencester Park are nearly a hundred letters of Mary's, a few of which were written to Lady Apsley but most to her daughter Frances, who married Sir Benjamin Bathurst. About a

third were
written before Mary's marriage and all before
the Revolution.² The Princess styled herself Mary Clorine
and pretended to be the wife of her friend Aurelia, as
Frances
Apsley was called— and the pretence was kept
up after she

¹ *Lettres et memoires de Marie, Reine d' Angle terre*, ed. Countess Bentinck (1880). Cf. Burnet, *Own Time*, i. 720-6 ; Supplement, pp. 266-7. Stanley also saw the correspondence. Gutch, op. cit. i. 302-6.

² A. B. Bathurst published " a few of these letters in the History of the Apsley and Bathurst Families (1903) ; a larger number in the Quarterly Review, Jan. 1911, and aU of them in Letters of Two Queens (*ca.* 1924).